

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 27-34 are all of the claims presently pending in the application. Applicants have canceled claims 2-26 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have amended claim 1 to define the claimed invention more particularly. Applicants have added claims 27-34 to provide more varied protection for the claimed invention.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 1-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 1, 2, and 5-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taranto (U.S. Patent No. 6,120,069) in view of Baker (U.S. Patent No. 5,516, 163). Claims 10-12 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taranto in view of Neumann et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,854,919; hereinafter “Neumann”) in view of Baker. Claims 22-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Taranto in view of Baker and Neumann. Claims 25 and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Taranto in view of Neumann.

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

Applicants submit that the rejection of claims 1-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, the rejection of claims 10-12 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the rejection of claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and the rejection of claims 25 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), are rendered moot by Applicants amendment to claim 1 and the cancellation of claims 2-26.

With respect to amended claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on the alleged combination of Taranto and Baker, Applicants submit that the applied references, taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest, “*a cylindrical portion that accommodates the cam member is formed on the operation handle*”, as recited in claim 1.

According to the claimed invention, the cam member is securely held. This feature is not taught or suggested by the cited references.

Applicants have added new claims 27-34 to claim additional features of the invention and to provide more varied protection for the claimed invention. These claims are independently patentable because of the novel and nonobvious features recited therein.

Applicants submit that new claims 27-34 are patentable over the cited prior art references at least for analogous reasons to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicants concurrently submit herewith new Figures 22 and 23 and amend the Specification accordingly. No new matter has been added.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that claims 1 and 27-34, all of the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, Applicants requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.


Serial No. 10/702,038
Docket No. P21-163397M/MNN

9

Applicants authorizes the Commissioner to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0510.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: November 13, 2007



Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Registration No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, VA 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254